

## Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 GENEVA 02778 221938Z  
ACTION SS-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 DODE-00 CIAE-00  
INRE-00 /026 W  
-----119603 230425Z /13  
R 221805Z FEB 78  
FM USMISSION GENEVA  
TO SECSTATE WASHDC 6292

S E C R E T GENEVA 02778

EXDIS

USSALTTWO

E.O. 11652: XGDS-1  
TAGS: PARM  
SUBJECT: DRAFTING GROUP MEETING NO. 193, FEBRUARY  
22, 1978 (SALT TWO - 1630)

REF: SALT TWO 1624

SUMMARY: US REVIEWED ITS PROPOSAL FOR BAN ON FLIGHT-  
TESTING AND DEPLOYMENT OO ASBMS DURING TERM OF PROTOCOL,  
SUGGESTING THAT THESE WERE AMONG WEAPONS ON WHICH  
DECISIONS SHOULD BE DEFERRED. SOVIETS QUERIED U.S.  
RATIONALE BUT RESERVED THEIR OWN POSITION. SOVIETS  
THEN POSED SERIES OF QUESTIONS RE U.S. CRUISE MISSILE  
RANGE DEFINITION, KEYED TO U.S. PRESENTATION IN  
PREVIOUS MEETING (SALT TWO 1624). END SUMMARY.

1. PEREZ SET FORTH DETAILED RATIONALE FOR U.S. PROPOSAL  
BANNING FLIGHT-TESTING AND DEPLOYMENT OF ASBMS FOR PERIOD  
OF PROTOCOL, NOTING THAT THEIR CASE WAS ANALOGOUS TO  
THAT OF MOBILE ICBMS ON WHICH FINAL DECISION IS TO BE  
DEFERRED TO SALT THREE. U.S. PROPOSAL FOR ARTICLE IV OO  
PROTOCOL CONTINGENT UPON SOVIET ACCEPTANCE OF OTHER  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 GENEVA 02778 221938Z

U.S. PROPOSALS ON ASBMS IN TREATY AND DOES NOT ATTEMPT  
TO PREJUDGE OUTCOME OF FUTURE NEGOTIATIONS. IF THERE  
IS NO DECISION TO BAN ASBMS AFTER PROTOCOL PERIOD,  
UNCONSTRAINED DEPLOYMENT OF ASBMS WOULD NOT BE IN INTEREST  
OF EITHER SIDE; THEREFORE SPECIFIC PROVISIONS GOVERNING  
THEM NEEDED IN TREATY, UNLIKE CASE OF MOBILE ICBMS WHICH  
ALREADY INCLUDED IN AGREED DEFINITION OF ICBMS. IF

ASBMS WERE EVENTUALLY PERMITTED, WHETHER MIRVED OR NOT, THEY WOULD BE REPLACEMENTS FOR OTHER LAUNCHERS. IF MIRVED, THEY WOULD COUNT WITHIN 1200 AND 1320 SUBLIMITS.

2. KARPOV ASKED WHY U.S. DID NOT PROPOSE AGREED STATEMENT COVERING ASBMS, AS CONTAINED IN ART. II.1 ON MOBILE ICBMS DEALING WITH "UNLESS" THE PARTIES AGREE OTHERWISE. PEREZ REPLIED THAT U.S. PROPOSAL CARRIED SAME CONNOTATION. KARPOV QUERIED U.S. SUGGESTION THAT ACCEPTANCE OF ITS PROPOSAL ON PROTOCOL ART. IV WOULD MEAN DELETION OF REFERENCE TO ASBMS IN ART. XI.3 OF TREATY. PEREZ POINTED OUT THAT IF ASBMS BANNED IN PROTOCOL QUESTION OF THEIR DISMANTLING OR DESTRUCTION WOULD NOT ARISE. KARPOV PURSUED MATTER BY ASKING WHAT WOULD HAPPEN IF A SIDE ALREADY HAS A COUPLE OF ASBMS. PEREZ NOTED THAT IN THIS HYPOTHETICAL CASE THEY SHOULD BE DEALT WITH IN ACCORDANCE WITH AGREED PROCEDURES. KARPOV SAID U.S. WAS SUGGESTING DIFFERENT LIMITATIONS FOR ASBMS THAN FOR MIRVED ICBMS. PEREZ COMMENTED THAT ASBMS LIMITED BY AGREEMENT WERE THOSE WITH RANGE OVER 600 KM, BUT FOR PRACTICAL REASONS MOST ASBMS WOULD BE OF LONGER RANGE ALTHOUGH THIS NOT NECESSARILY SO.

3. KARPOV ATTACKED U.S. PROPOSAL FOR CRUISE MISSILE RANGE DEFINITION, NOTING THAT AT PREVIOUS DRAFTING GROUP MEETING U.S. HAD SAID THAT CM RANGE WAS ASSOCIATED WITH SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 GENEVA 02778 221938Z

DESIGN OF PARTICULAR MISSILE. PEREZ EXPLAINED THAT U.S. DEFINITION REFERS TO MAXIMUM DISTANCE AT WHICH TARGET CAN BE EFFECTIVELY ENGAGED, AND THAT MODERN CM HAS AMONG ITS IMPORTANT INHERENT CHARACTERISTICS ABILITY TO MANEUVER. CM WOULD THEREFORE BE DESIGNED TO EXPLOIT THAT CAPABILITY IN ORDER TO CARRY OUT ITS MISSION IN MOST EFFECTIVE MANNER. FREW ADDED THAT SOVIET DEFINITION WOULD PERMIT VERTICAL MANEUVERING BUT PENALIZE A SYSTEM FOR LATERAL MANEUVERS. KARPOV INSISTED SOVIET OBJECTIVE WAS NOT TO PENALIZE ANYONE BUT THAT CLEAR CRITERIA WERE NEEDED WHICH WOULD INSURE THAT MISSILE COULD NOT EXCEED AGREED RANGE LIMITATIONS, REGARDLESS OF ITS DESIGN. TASK OF NEGOTIATORS WAS TO AGREE TO PROVISIONS MEETING BOTH SIDES NEED FOR SECURITY AND NOT TO DISCUSS OPERATIONAL USE OF WEAPONS. IF, UNDER US DEFINITION, CM COULD FLY MORE THAN 2500 KM, WHY DID SIDES ESTABLISH THAT LIMITATION? MCNEILL POINTED OUT THAT, AS EXPLAINED BY SOVIETS PREVIOUSLY, U.S.S.R. PROPOSED DEFINITION COULD HAVE SAME EFFECT.

4. PEREZ OBSERVED THAT U.S. WOULD NOT DESIGN MISSILE CAPABLE OF EFFECTIVELY ENGAGING TARGET BEYOND 2500 KM. AND

THAT CM WOULD BE OF NO MILITARY VALUE IF IT HAD TO FLY  
DIRECT LINE TO TARGET AT 2500 KM. RANGE. U.S. DEFINITION  
SECRET

IS OBJECTIVE AND REALISTIC WHEREAS SOVIET DEFINITION  
IS ARBITRARY AND UNREALISTIC AS IT WOULD DREVENT CM ROM  
REACHING TARGETS AT THE RANGES WHICH AD BEEN AGREED  
UPON. EARLE

SECRET

NNN

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** Z  
**Capture Date:** 01 jan 1994  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** MEETINGS, SALT (ARMS CONTROL)  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 22 feb 1978  
**Decaption Date:** 20 Mar 2014  
**Decaption Note:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 20 Mar 2014  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1978GENEVA02778  
**Document Source:** CORE  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** X1  
**Errors:** N/A  
**Expiration:**  
**Film Number:** D780083-0370  
**Format:** TEL  
**From:** GENEVA USSALTTWO  
**Handling Restrictions:**  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1978/newtext/t19780229/aaaaaylx.tel  
**Line Count:** 124  
**Litigation Code IDs:**  
**Litigation Codes:**  
**Litigation History:**  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM  
**Message ID:** da292bd2-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc  
**Office:** ACTION SS  
**Original Classification:** SECRET  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** EXDIS  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 3  
**Previous Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Previous Classification:** SECRET  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** EXDIS  
**Reference:** 78 SALT TALKS 1624  
**Retention:** 0  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 26 jul 2005  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**SAS ID:** 3525251  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** DRAFTING GROUP MEETING NO. 193, FEBRUARY 22, 1978 (SALT TWO - 1630)  
**TAGS:** PARM  
**To:** STATE  
**Type:** TE  
**vdkgvwkey:** odb://SAS/SAS.dbo.SAS\_Docs/da292bd2-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc  
**Review Markings:**  
Sheryl P. Walter  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
20 Mar 2014  
**Markings:** Sheryl P. Walter Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 20 Mar 2014